IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please find attached a single sheet of drawings containing new Figures 16A and 16B. These figures illustrate a process claimed and described in the application. The specification has been amended to reference these two (2) new additional figures.

Applicant requests that the attached sheet of drawings be entered into the file and made a part of the application.

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 18, 19, 27, 28, 32, and 34-41 remain in this application. Claims 9 and 31-41 have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests entry of this amendment on the grounds that it places the Application in condition for allowance or in the alternative, considerably reduces the issues on appeal.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) on the grounds that they did not disclose every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically the Office Action pointed out that the process as recited in Claim 32 wherein the dielectric material application process uses dielectric material containing gap members, was not shown in the drawings.

Applicant submits herewith, under cover of a letter to a chief draftsperson, additional Figures 16a and 16b. Figure 16a illustrates the method of production recited in Claim 19. Figure 16b illustrates the method of production recited in Claim 32. Applicant respectfully requests entry of these drawings.

Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 19, and 27 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Murai et al.* (JP 10-302645). Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Office Action points to the partition walls 11 of *Murai* which are interposed between oppositely disposed panel substrates to divide the light emitting regions one from the other as being the gap members of the present invention. The partition walls are manufactured by using a metallic material, with iron as a major constituent, and containing chromium and nickel. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 19 specifically recites, "A plurality of gap members having a spherical or rod shape are disposed at locations corresponding to boundary areas between and excluding the center areas of the discharge cells so as to separate the first substrate and second substrate and

determine the interval between the first substrate and second substrate". The partition walls 11 of *Murai* are quite distinct structurally from the recited "gap members" of Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the gas discharge panel of Claim 1 is patentable over *Murai*.

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1, and further limits Claim 1. Claim 12 depends from Claim 1, and further limits Claim 1. Claim 13 depends from Claim 1, and further limits Claim 1.

Applicant submits that these Claims are patentable over *Murai* for the reasons stated above for Claim 1.

Claim 19 recites a method for producing a gas discharge panel having the step of, "A gap member distribution process, for disposing gap members having a spherical or rod shape at locations on the first substrate or the second substrate corresponding to boundaries between discharge cells".

The Office Action recognizes that *Murai* teaches barrier ribs instead of gap members of a specific shape, *i.e.* spherical or rod-shaped, but contends that the recitation of gap members at the boundaries does not structurally differentiate over the barrier ribs of *Murai*. Applicant respectfully submits that the spherical or rod-shaped gap members structurally distinguish, in a patentable manner, over the *Murai* reference.

Claim 27 depends from Claim 19, and further limits Claim 19. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 27 is patentable over *Murai* for the reasons stated above for Claim 19.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 19, and 27 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 12-14, 18, 19, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Amemiya et al.* (5,742,122). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 calls for a gas discharge panel having a plurality of gap members, "having a spherical or rod-shape...disposed at locations corresponding to boundary areas between and excluding the center areas of the discharge cells, so as to separate the first substrate and second substrate and determine the interval between the first substrate and second substrate".

Claim 19 calls for a method of producing a gas discharge panel by utilizing a gap member distribution process, "for disposing gap members having a spherical or rod shape at locations on the first substrate or the second substrate corresponding to boundaries between discharge cells".

Claim 32 calls for a method producing a gas discharge panel by using a dielectric element material application process to cover the electrodes, "the dielectric element material containing gap members for determining an interval between the first substrate and a second substrate".

Regarding Claim 1, the Office Action points to element 31 of *Amemiya,* a barrier rib formed on the internal surface of a back side substrate 2 that faces the front side substrate 1 in the gas discharge space 4 as being a gap member. These ribs are disposed parallel to each other and perpendicular to the sustaining electrodes. The purpose of the barrier rib is to improve the contrast of the display images. The barrier rib is made out of a reflective material such as a hardened white or transparent glass paste or a paste that includes a black pigment such as iron oxidized, cobalt oxidized, or chromium oxidized (Column 5, Lines 37-47). *Amemiya* does not show or teach spherical or rod-shaped gap members to determine the interval between the first substrate and second substrate.

Claims 2-4, 12-14, and 18 depend from, and further limit Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that these Claims are patentable and distinct over *Amemiya* for the same reason set forth above for Claim 1.

With respect to Claim 19 *Amemiya* does not show or describe a method of producing a gas discharge panel which utilizes a gap member distribution process for disposing gap members having a spherical or rod shape on the first or second substrate.

With respect to Claim 32 *Amemiya* does not disclose a method for producing a gas discharge panel by a dielectric element material application process wherein, using "dielectric element material containing gap members for determining an interval between the first substrate and a second substrate".

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 8, 10, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Aoki et al.* (US 6,369,501). Applicant respectfully traverses.

With respect to Claim 1 the Office Action points to the partition wall 17 of *Aoki* which is a glass material repeatedly printed with a screen print method and then baked to create the partition wall 17, as the gap members of Claim 1. Claim 1 recites a plurality of gap members, "having a spherical or rod shape...disposed at locations corresponding to locations at boundary areas...so as to separate the first substrate and second substrate and determine the interval between the first substrate and second substrate". *Aoki* simply does not disclose or teach such a structure.

Claims 8, 10, and 18 depend from, and further limit Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentably distinct over *Aoki* for the reasons set forth for above Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Knagu et al.* (U.S. 6,538,380). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Knagu discloses providing a plurality of separating walls 29 on a dielectric layer 24 between adjacent address electrodes A. The main material of the separator walls 29 is a low melting point glass. The separating walls are colored by a dark color pigment to improve the contrast of the display.

Knagu does not show or teach a method of making a gas discharge panel wherein a dielectric element material application process is used, "for applying a dielectric element material to cover the electrodes, the dielectric element material containing gap members for determining an interval between the first substrate and a second substrate".

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 12-14, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over applicant's admission of the prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 calls for, "a plurality of gap members having a spherical or rod shape...disposed at locations corresponding to boundary areas between and excluding the center areas of the discharge cells, so as to separate the first substrate and second substrate, and determine the interval between the first substrate and a second substrate".

Claim 19 recites a method for producing a gas discharge panel which utilizes a gap member distribution process, "for disposing gap members having a spherical or rod shape at locations on the first substrate or the second substrate corresponding to boundaries between discharge cells".

The prior art disclosed by applicant in Figure 15 which utilizes barrier ribs 124, simply does not show or teach the limitations of Claims 1 and 19.

Claims 12-14 depend from Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that these Claims are patentable over the disclosed prior art in applicant's application for the reasons stated above for Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Murai* in view of *Ha et al.* (6,252,353). Applicant respectfully traverses Claim 5 depends from Claim 2 which depends from Claim 1, further limiting Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 5 is patentable over *Murai* in view of *Ha* for the reasons set forth above for the patentability of Claim 1 over *Murai.*

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Amemiya* in view of *Yoshioka* (JP 03-233829). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 6 depends from Claim 2 which depends from Claim 1, and further limits Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 6 is patentable over *Amemiya* in view of *Yoshioka* for the same reasons that Claim 1 is patentable over *Amemiya* as set forth above.

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Murai* in view of *Osawa et al.* (5,892,492). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 7 depends from Claim 1. Claim 35 depends from Claim 2 which depends from Claim 1. Both Claims 7 and 35 further limit Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7 and 35 are patentable over *Murai* in view of *Osawa* for the reasons set for above for the patentability of Claim 1 over *Murai.*

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 35-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Amemiya et al.* in view of *Osawa.* Applicant respectfully traverses Claim 7 depends from Claim 1. Claim 35 depends from Claim 2 which depends from Claim 1. Claim 36 depends from Claim 3 which depends from Claim 2 which depends from Claim 1. Claim 37 depends from Claim 4 which depends from Claim 2 which depends from Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7 and 35-37 are patentable over *Amemiya* in view of *Osawa* for the reasons set forth above for the patentability of Claim 1 over *Amemiya.*

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Murai* in view of *Shinoda et al.* (JP 60-107233). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 11 depends from Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11 is patentable over a combination of *Murai* and *Shinoda* for the reasons set forth above for the patentability of Claim 1 over *Murai.*

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Murai* in view of *Amemiya.* Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 18 depends from Claim 1, and further limits Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 18 is patentable over *Murai* in view of *Amemiya* for the same reasons set forth above for the patentability of Claim 1 over *Murai.*

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over applicant's admission of prior art in view of *Amemiya.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 18 depends from Claim 1, and further limits Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 18 is patentable over the admission of prior art in the present Application even in view of *Amemiya* for the reasons set forth above for the patentability of Claim 1 over *Amemiya* over *Murai*.

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 19, 27, 28, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Miyahara* (JP 01-183029) in view of *Murai et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 19 recites a gap member distribution process, "for disposing gap members having a spherical or rod shape at locations on the first substrate or the second substrate corresponding to boundaries between discharge cells".

Claim 27 depends from Claim 19. Claim 28 depends from Claim 27 which depends from Claim 19. Claim 34 depends from 27 which depends from Claim 19.

Miyahara teaches, "After that, spacers more than the numbers of pedestals 5 are scattered evenly on the substrate". This is hardly a teaching of gap members in spherical or rod shape located on the first or second substrate corresponding to boundaries between the discharge cells. As noted above *Murai* is of no help.

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Murai* in view of *Ha* as applied to Claim 5 and further in view of *Osawa.* Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 38 depends from Claim 5 which depends from Claim 2 which depends from Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 38 is allowable over *Murai* in view of *Ha* and further in view of *Osawa* for the reasons set forth above for the patentability of Claim 1 over *Murai.* Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In light of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant believes that all the claims in the Application are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that this Application be passed to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, No. EV 456688286 US in an envelope addressed to the MAIL STOP AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 23, 2005.

By: Marc Fregoso

Signature

Dated: June 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

Albin H. Gess
Registration No. 25,726
1920 Main Street, Suite 1200
Irvine, California 92614-7230
Telephone: (949) 253-2720